

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CRAIG DION GREEN,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:12-cv-944

v.

Honorable Paul L. Maloney

CARMEN D. PALMER,

Respondent.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This is a habeas corpus action brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Promptly after the filing of a petition for habeas corpus, the Court must undertake a preliminary review of the petition to determine whether “it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court.” Rule 4, RULES GOVERNING § 2254 CASES; *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If so, the petition must be summarily dismissed. Rule 4; *see Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970) (district court has the duty to “screen out” petitions that lack merit on their face). A dismissal under Rule 4 includes those petitions which raise legally frivolous claims, as well as those containing factual allegations that are palpably incredible or false. *Carson v. Burke*, 178 F.3d 434, 436-37 (6th Cir. 1999). The Court may *sua sponte* dismiss a habeas action as time-barred under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). *Day v. McDonough*, 547 U.S. 198, 209 (2006). After undertaking the review required by Rule 4, I conclude that the petition is barred by the one-year statute of limitations.

Discussion

I. Factual Allegations

Petitioner is incarcerated in the Michigan Reformatory. He pleaded *nolo contendere* in the Wayne County Circuit Court to one count of assault with intent to murder and one count of possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony, second offense, and was sentenced on July 18, 2007. Petitioner sought leave to appeal in the Michigan appellate courts raising one claim, which is now his first ground for habeas corpus relief. The Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court denied Petitioner's applications for leave to appeal on March 21, 2008 and December 23, 2008, respectively.

On March 23, 2011, Petitioner filed a motion for relief from judgment in the Wayne County Circuit Court under M.C.R. 6.500 *et seq.* Petitioner raised five new claims, which are included as his second through sixth grounds for habeas corpus relief. The Wayne County Circuit Court denied his motion on June 21, 2011, because Petitioner failed to meet the requirements of M.C.R. 6.508(D)(3)(a), which requires good cause to bring grounds for relief that could have been raised on direct appeal. The circuit court also found that, notwithstanding his procedural default, Petitioner's claims were without merit. The Michigan Court of Appeals denied Petitioner's application for leave to appeal on December 8, 2011, for failure to meet the burden of establishing entitlement to relief under M.C.R. 6.508(D). The Michigan Supreme Court also relied upon M.C.R. 6.508(D) when it denied leave to appeal on July 24, 2012.

Petitioner now presents the following six grounds for habeas corpus relief (verbatim):

1. Whether the trial court's order of restitution as a condition of parole must be vacated where the trial court failed to consider defendant's ability to pay.

2. Due process requires plea withdrawal where Defendant was taking psychotropic medication and the court failed to ascertain defendant's mental state at the time of the plea proceeding.
3. Defendant has been deprived of his right to the effective assistance of counsel and to a fair trial, where trial counsel failed to pursue the cognizable defense of mental illness and mental retardation which was available at the time of [Petitioner's] plea, and failed to adversarially test the prosecutor's theory of the case, in violation of the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Mich. Const. 1963, Art 1, §§ 17, 20.
4. Defendant was denied the effective assistance of trial counsel as guaranteed by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments, where counsel: (a) failed to investigate and present a defense by failing to file a pretrial motion for the suppression of the identification of defendant; (b) failed to obtain an expert in identification or properly challenge the identification; (c) the cumulative effect of counsel's errors deprived defendant of his federal and state due process rights under U.S. Const. Amends. V, VI, XIV and Const. 1963, Art. 1, §§ 17, 20.
5. Defendant was denied his Sixth and Fourteenth Amendment rights to the effective assistance of appellate counsel where appellate counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness resulting in prejudice.
6. Defendant meets the cause and prejudice standard set forth in 6.508(D) by showing constitutionally ineffective assistance of both trial and appellate counsel in violation of the Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel, and the Fourteenth Amendment due process rights clause.

(Pet., docket #1, Page ID##4-8; docket #1-1, Page ID##3-5.)

II. Statute of Limitations

Petitioner's application is barred by the one-year statute of limitations provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1), which became effective on April 24, 1996, as part of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, PUB. L. NO. 104-132, 110 STAT. 1214 (AEDPA). Prior to enactment

of the AEDPA, there was no defined period of limitation for habeas actions.¹ Section 2244(d)(1) provides:

(1) A 1-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of

(A) the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review;

(B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such State action;

(C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or

(D) the date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.

28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). The running of the statute of limitations is tolled when “a properly filed application for State post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment or claim is pending.” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2); *see also Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 181-82 (2001) (limiting the tolling provision to only State, and not Federal, processes); *Artuz v. Bennett*, 531 U.S. 4, 8 (2000) (defining “properly filed”).

In most cases, § 2244(d)(1)(A) provides the operative date from which the one-year limitations period is measured. Under that provision, the one-year limitations period runs from “the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review.” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A). Petitioner appealed his conviction to the

¹Previously, the only time limit was provided in Rule 9 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, which allows dismissal of a petition only under circumstances where the state has been prejudiced by the delay in filing.

Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court. The Michigan Supreme Court denied his application on December 23, 2008. Petitioner did not petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court. The one-year limitations period, however, did not begin to run until the ninety-day period in which Petitioner could have sought review in the United States Supreme Court had expired. *See Lawrence v. Florida*, 549 U.S. 327, 332-33 (2007); *Bronaugh v. Ohio*, 235 F.3d 280, 283 (6th Cir. 2000). The ninety-day period expired on March 23, 2009. Petitioner had one year, until March 23, 2010, to file his habeas application. Petitioner filed the instant petition on or about September 4, 2012, more than two years after the statute of limitations expired. Thus, his application is time-barred.

Although 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2) provides that the one-year statute of limitations is tolled while a duly filed petition for state collateral review is pending, the tolling provision does not revive the limitations period or restart the clock; it can only serve to pause a clock that has not yet fully run. *Payton v. Brigano*, 256 F.3d 405, 408 (6th Cir. 2001). Consequently, once the limitations period is expired, collateral petitions can no longer serve to avoid a statute of limitations. *Id.*; *McClendon v. Sherman*, 329 F.3d 490, 493 (6th Cir. 2003). Even where the post-conviction motion raises a claim of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel, the filing of the motion for relief from judgment does not revive the statute of limitations. *See Allen v. Yukins*, 366 F.3d 396, 401 (6th Cir. 2004) (citing *McClendon*, 329 F.3d at 490). Because Petitioner's one-year period expired in 2010, his 2011 motion for relief from judgment could not serve to revive the limitations period.

The one-year limitations period applicable to § 2254 is a statute of limitations subject to equitable tolling. *See Holland v. Florida*, 130 S. Ct. 2549, 2560 (2010); *Akrawi v. Booker*, 572 F.3d 252, 260 (6th Cir. 2009); *Keenan v. Bagley*, 400 F.3d 417, 420 (6th Cir. 2005). A petitioner

bears the burden of showing that he is entitled to equitable tolling. *See Keenan*, 400 F.3d at 420; *Allen v. Yukins*, 366 F.3d 396, 401 (6th Cir. 2004). The Sixth Circuit repeatedly has cautioned that equitable tolling should be applied “sparingly” by this Court. *See, e.g., Hall v. Warden, Lebanon Corr. Inst.*, 662 F.3d 745, 749 (6th Cir. 2011); *Robertson v. Simpson*, 624 F.3d 781, 784 (6th Cir. 2010); *Sherwood v. Prelesnik*, 579 F.3d 581, 588 (6th Cir. 2009). A petitioner seeking equitable tolling of the habeas statute of limitations has the burden of establishing two elements: “(1) that he has been pursuing his rights diligently, and (2) that some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way.” *Holland*, 130 S. Ct. at 2562 (citing *Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 418 (2005)); *Lawrence*, 549 U.S. at 335; *Hall*, 662 F.3d at 750; *Akrawi*, 572 F.3d at 260.

Petitioner has failed to raise equitable tolling or allege any facts or circumstances that would warrant its application in this case. The fact that Petitioner is untrained in the law, was proceeding without a lawyer, or may have been unaware of the statute of limitations for a certain period does not warrant tolling. *See Allen*, 366 F.3d at 403-04; *see also Craig v. White*, 227 F. App’x 480, 482 (6th Cir. 2007); *Harvey v. Jones*, 179 F. App’x 294, 299-300 (6th Cir. 2006); *Martin v. Hurley*, 150 F. App’x 513, 516 (6th Cir. 2005); *Fisher v. Johnson*, 174 F.3d 710, 714 (5th Cir. 1999) (“[I]gnorance of the law, even for an incarcerated *pro se* petitioner, generally does not excuse [late] filing.”). Accordingly, Petitioner is not entitled to equitable tolling of the statute of limitations.

The Supreme Court has directed the District Court to give fair notice and an adequate opportunity to be heard before dismissal of a petition on statute of limitations grounds. *See Day*, 547 U.S. at 210. This report and recommendation shall therefore serve as notice that the District Court may dismiss Petitioner’s application for habeas corpus relief as time-barred. The opportunity to file

objections to this report and recommendation constitutes Petitioner's opportunity to be heard by the District Judge.

Recommended Disposition

For the foregoing reasons, I recommend that the habeas corpus petition be denied because it is barred by the one-year statute of limitations. I further recommend that a certificate of appealability be denied. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000).

Dated: September 20, 2012

/s/ Joseph G. Scoville
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO PARTIES

Any objections to this Report and Recommendation must be filed and served within 14 days of service of this notice on you. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). All objections and responses to objections are governed by W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). Failure to file timely objections may constitute a waiver of any further right of appeal. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981); *see Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).